

A decorative rectangular border with ornate, symmetrical scrollwork and floral patterns at the corners and midpoints.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

GARRETT LIBRARY
GARRETT, INDIANA

Bundling Prohibited!

NO 05 '92
GARRETT LIBRARY
GARRETT, INDIANA

OCT 19

To read my booke the virgin shie
May blush, while Brutus standeth by:
But when he's gone, read through what's writ,
And never staine a cheeke for it.

—Herrick's *Hesperides*.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED !

-- SIGN IN McCONNELLSBURG, PA., HOTEL.

Pennsylvania History, Folk-Lore and Sociology

(A Supplement to)

Bundling; . . . and
More About Bundling

By A. MONROE AURAND, JR.

MEMBER:

THE PENNA.-GERMAN SOCIETY; THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF PENNA.;
PENNA. SOCIETY, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION;
THE AMERICAN LEGION, &c.



Privately Printed by
THE AURAND PRESS
HARRISBURG, PA.

1929

LIMITED EDITION!
900 COPIES

Copyright 1929 — By A. Monroe Aurand, Jr.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

PREFACE.

Slightly more than a year has passed since the publication of *Bundling; and, More About Bundling*, and much the same motive which prompted the publication of the above title a year ago, (that of preserving curious and interesting facts), brings about the urge to supplement it with some additional stray accounts which have been gathered from "here and there," since that time.

* * * * *

Simultaneously with the publication of our edition of a year ago, there appeared in New York a fac-simile, or "pirated" reprint of the original edition of *Bundling*, still bearing the date "1871." That edition is offered at various prices up to \$5.00, and its publishers have been able to make some slight capital on the advertising which was occasioned upon the appearance of our limited edition. The publishers and dealers offering the fac-simile edition have also laid stress upon the rather flimsy excuse that our edition, with Stiles' reprint, "does not contain an index," a deficiency which, (if it can be termed as such), has been corrected.

An explanation on our part is hardly necessary, though in passing, may we add that our contemporaries have given the book buying public nothing new, and their criticism of our edition has provoked sufficient reaction in our office alone, to cause this supplement to appear. It contains additions to the new material which appeared in our privately printed limited edition of *More About Bundling*, from bundlers themselves, or from other unquestioned authority. It is quite in place to state here that our edition of *Bundling; and, More About Bundling* is strictly limited to less than 1000 copies, each copy numbered and signed by the author and publisher of the privately printed edition.

That our new account, *More About Bundling*, was well received by book-lovers and others, is now a settled matter, and of more than ordinary satisfaction to students of history and folk-lore. Linking with it Dr. Stiles' account of *Bundling*

PREFACE.

was justifiable, and the presenting of additional historical data on this old-time custom in the light of our present lingering knowledge, will not be unwelcome to those who have our previous edition.

Attempts to gather new material and facts have been made; with much difficulty we have gone into the highways and by-ways, and the results have been quite satisfactory. Inquiry in various localities oft-times failed to bring any information; even in New England persons in the younger generation have seemingly never heard of *bundling*. As a custom, particularly as practiced of old, it seems to be passing, slowly, but surely.

Our friend, the librarian of the American Antiquarian Society, of Worcester, Mass., writes as follows:

Worcester, Mass., June 8, 1929.

Mr. A. M. Aurand, Jr.,
Harrisburg, Pa.

Dear Sir:

I am of course interested in your new edition, or supplement to the book on "Bundling." I do not happen to think of any new material in this Library, as the books by Stiles and yourself covered the subject fairly thoroughly. Of course we have the originals of the one or two broadsides which Stiles mentions but which were reprinted, but not in facsimile.

Very truly yours,
C. S. BRIGHAM, Librarian.

We have interviewed Pennsylvania-Germans; Scotch, Irish, Jews, Chinese, and who not, to learn that they have, as a race, or class of people, been neither more nor less than "bundling sons of women." The strange part of it being that they have been ignorant, most generally, of the fact that their practices have been, or nearly so, what we now know as *Bundling*.

In the compiling of these various accounts we have had numerous instances told us, some of which have for the moment been forgotten; others will perhaps form the basis for further folk-lore stories and accounts at some future date. In the meanwhile we trust that the reader will have as much pleasure and profit in the hearing of these accounts, as it was our pleasure in collecting them from our friends.

A. MONROE AURAND, JR.

Harrisburg, Pa., September 1929.

Bundling Prohibited!

THE illustrations we present are reminders of days of other years — "gone, but not forgotten!" It is typical of many incidents in a life-time, as is suggested in "I am curious to know." (Cover design.)

How many travelling men, a generation or more ago, hoped to find peace and comfort at city hotels, and rural inns, with some companion they happened to know in the various places they "made" from time to time? "At last we are alone," has been the thought of many a professional, as well as "semi-pro" and amateur, and the hopes of days, and months often reached fruition as depicted in the *frontispiece*.

There are two sides to the matter however, and on the "other hand" we have those who represent the "rank and file," whose curiosity is but natural, even though the practice under discussion was common. These illustrations are but sequels to that injunction which says: "*Bundling by Hotel Guests Prohibited!*" — of which more is to follow.

The maid whose curiosity is aroused typifies the natural curiosity of man. This is especially true in public places, such as hotels, pullman cars, steam-boats, and road-houses of 1929! The illustrations used are an artist's conception as of thirty years ago! A pair of ladies' and a pair of man's shoes, placed together outside the room for "shining;" a "keyhole," and some one to "rubber," completes the picture.

In the *frontispiece* the hotel retinue holds to the theory that the couple may have been "just married," or are about to *bundle*! Do they *bundle* in 1929 as they did thirty years ago; or in 1829; or 1729? The scene might easily be placed at any hotel or state-room door anywhere. "Bundling," as a term for a custom of many years' practice, may have been forgotten by all but a few well-read people, or practitioners in rural communities, where it still lingers. But the practice of it by the populace at large is quite general; the difference being noted in slight changes due to the constant change in the manners and characteristics of the human race at large, particularly in America.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

* * * * *

One of the outstanding facts is that so few persons — even of the intellectual class—are familiar with the meaning of the word *bundling*. The custom, or practice of it, seems to be recalled by a few after an explanation of the meaning. It follows that most persons who profess any knowledge of history, custom and folk-lore, know that men and women have bundled, or courted, from the beginning of time. The study of men and women of the various races; their customs and habits, particularly around the mating and courting seasons, is most interesting. Some times one is lead to believe that the most curious things happen thousands of miles from home — in some other country, or climate. After all, human nature is generally pretty much the same the world over, and while there may be scores or even hundreds of ways to kill a horse, in the end the results amount to the same.

So with folks when they bundled many years ago — and in more recent times. New England has heretofore been pretty much singled out as the seat of origin of *bundling*, and nearly all citations pertaining to America, were from that section of the country.

Surprising then, and not a little, to read in a Harrisburg newspaper, subsequent to the publication of *More About Bundling*, Harrisburg, (1928), an article which makes it appear that Pennsylvania has equal honors with any New England State! For lo and behold, bundling had become so objectionable, or had fallen into such ill-favor, that a Pennsylvania hotel-keeper some few years ago had to put up a prohibitory sign! And for Pennsylvania hotels, and especially what was then unquestionably a very rural community, we consider that as "going some!" Nevertheless it is true, and the account we reprint speaks for itself.

* * * * *

In H. Hollister's *Contributions to the History of the Lackawanna Valley*, published in 1857, page 84, we read: "'Bundling,' that easy, but wicked habit of our grandfathers, appears to have been wonderfully prevalent at an early period along the valley, as well as in many other portions of the country, and was not infrequently attended with consequences that might naturally have been looked for. Besides this, there is every reason to believe that the current morals of the day had the greatest liberality of standard."

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

We read in Dr. Stiles' treatise that there were in old New England days, what were known as "professional bundlers." Anthony Van Corlar, whom we read of in Knickerbocker's *History of New York*, seems to come in the class just referred to. There were undoubtedly those without number who indulged in this practice and custom, from pure love of the "sport," and who went about from place to place for the pleasure thus derived. We read again in *Notions of the Americans: Picked up by a Travelling Bachelor*, Philadelphia, (1828, 2 volumes), the author's (an Englishman), observations and some reflections made to him by his friend and travelling companion, John Cadwallader, of New York. The latter told the Englishman that "motives exist in certain customs that distinguished us (Americans), in a greater or less degree, from every other people. In no other country, is the same freedom of intercourse (social) between the unmarried of the two sexes, permitted, as in America."

* * * * *

Travel, such as it was, say in 1828, was still done mostly on horse-back, stage-coach, canal-boat, or steam-boat. At best, the arrangements accorded travellers in those days were none too elaborate. Bath-rooms, modern lighting, and piped-water facilities were unheard of. Commodious living, especially sleeping quarters, were not found in many localities. A few of the rich in the early days desported fine accommodations, but those who travelled from place to place had to be content with what lot befell them.

Picture if you will, America a hundred years ago, with most travelling done by stage-coach, or canal-packet — the common mode. Inns, taverns and hotels dotted the roads, turn-pikes and canal routes everywhere. The taverns became early in the development of the country, the most important place of congregations in all villages and hamlets. Here would gather not only the travelling public, but also the rank and file of the community served by the tavern. Prayer-meetings, dances, gambling, political plots, battle-planning in war, industrial expansion in time of peace, and what-not, were the day's doings at the "ordinary," a century and more ago. Early in the history of America the ordinary, or tavern, was established, or rather required in each community, oft-times by act of law. Thus it can be seen that what we now know as "hotels," were one-time places of more than ordinary importance.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

As places of entertainment, they were necessary to the traveller, and much might be said in their behalf in the 18th and 19th centuries. At about the close of the Revolutionary War, and subsequent to that time, for many years, the tavern or hotel, provided a place for rest, recreation and refreshment to all who travelled—king, or vassal; president, or citizen-ordinary; general, or private. Of course, in those days they expected but a place to eat, and to sleep, or at least rest.

* * * * *

But times then were not much different than today — as one notes the great number of places along the highways and avenues of commerce, where the traveller is enjoined to spend the night. A slight difference, however, is apparent today, where seldom, is the traveller asked whether he is single or married; and whether he has any right to occupy the same room, apartment, or compartment, with his female companion. Possibly a hundred years or more ago there existed a bit more of modesty or a sense of moral responsibility. Mistake not — travellers now enjoy the company of the opposite sex as much as ever, perhaps more so, but the license to do more, and the boldness with which it is done, is more than evident. Several generations back that which we can perhaps best term "advancing civilization" had not made very many persons "laws unto themselves," so we but occasionally find that transgressions had produced conditions in various localities from which they hoped to be delivered.

Whether the transgressors were "professionals" or whether from a growing tendency on the part of the public, we know not, but we do know that not many years ago bundling was frowned upon in Pennsylvania. No more concrete evidence of its having reached a high-point in this State is necessary than to behold a public warning posted in a hotel located on the main thoroughfare of a well-known frontier town in the south central part of the State.

While it was known as a local, or perhaps even general practice over nearly all of Pennsylvania many years ago, it was scarcely ever recorded as being obnoxious to the hotel or tavern-keeper. Nevertheless, just a year ago, upon the appearance of our account of *More About Bundling*, there was recalled one of the most interesting examples entirely in support of our contention that bundling was much practiced throughout Pennsylvania—as well as other nearby states.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

The better to acquaint the reader with the hotel warning and the circumstances surrounding its discovery, we shall reprint the entire reference to it, as noted by Mr. Mel. H. James, as follows:

From the Column entitled, "Call It A Day," conducted by "M. H. J.," appearing daily in the Harrisburg, (Pa.) "Telegraph."

"BUNDLING"

McConnellsburg, July 25, 1928.

About four years ago I was skirmishing through the attic of the Fulton House—an attic about ninety feet long and filled with a variety of exhibits, left by a long line of proprietors—when I came across a sign which puzzled me. It was an age-yellowed card in the sort of ornamental frame affected in Southern Pennsylvania a hundred years ago, and this is what it said:

.....
: **BUNDLING BY HOTEL GUESTS** :
: **PROHIBITED** :
:
:

As they say in Allentown, "it wondered me," but I was unable to find even an old-timer who knew what it meant. I thought it might refer to baggage arrangements, or something of that sort. Had I looked in the dictionary I should have known the meaning immediately. But I didn't think of Mr. Webster. This week, however, I chanced to see a book printed privately by the Aurand Press, of Harrisburg, and at last I knew the reason for the ancient warning. I spent two or three hours in the attic today, looking for it, without success. I understand there is a gentleman in town who knows where it went; and tomorrow he will be home.

The title of the Aurand-printed volume is "Bundling", and "More About Bundling." It deals with a practice declared to be existent today in some sections of Pennsylvania, although considered long since abandoned; and existing, too, it is said, in Vermont and Connecticut, in Ireland, Wales and certain parts of England. The volume is, first a reprint of a book printed over half a century ago in which "Bundling" is roundly condemned; and, second, some thoughts on the subject by A. M. Aurand, Jr., Harrisburg. When I say I never heard of "bundling" until a short time ago I tell the truth, but it occurs to me that few other persons know about it.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

What is "bundling?" Let Mr. Webster himself tell:

"To sleep or lie, as lovers, on the same bed without undressing."

Through all that section of Pennsylvania inhabited by those known as "Pennsylvania Germans" the peculiar practice of bundling was common enough some years after the Civil War; and a wayfarer on the porch of this hotel today told me that in less than four hours drive from McConnellsburg he can show me localities in which bundling occurs in 1928, and the residents of those sections think nothing of it. Like the old-time religion, it was good enough for their forefathers, and it's good enough for them.

Doubtless there are readers of this column who imagine the Aurand book is a contribution to the pornographic literature of this decadent age, but they are mistaken. It is a historical account of a peculiar habit of primitive peoples; and bundling had its origin long before there was a Pennsylvania or a Vermont. Perhaps the first bundling occurred in the caves of the ape-men, in the very dawn of history, when, regardless of ties of affinity or consanguinity, men, women and children huddled together in the darkness and slept. It continued through the thousands of years. It was prevalent among simple savages who wore not even a breach clout, but who—though there were no anatomical secrets in the tribe—were moral without knowing it. Doubtless there is no reward in life or in the hereafter for those who are moral without knowing it. Such rewards seem to be held in store only for those who are good in spite of the pleasures of being bad. In America bundling began when log huts became too small to accommodate with separate sleeping apartments the family and its visitors; and it reached its pinnacle when in Berks, Lancaster and Lebanon counties, Pennsylvania, girls and their lovers "bundled" with the full knowledge of parents who saw no wrong in the practice. It is recorded that occasionally there were mis-steps, but not often—compared with the extent of the observance.

So you will understand why I am curious over what became of the "No Bundling" sign which once must have ornamented this ancient hotel. Perhaps it hung on the wall in the room where the teamsters bantered the proprietor, or in the bar-room immediately in the rear. Or perhaps it hung in the old hall, where wayfarers saw it on their journeys to their rooms. The oldest resident knows nothing about it—never heard of "bundling"—although he is so old that he was standing on the steps of the Fulton House the morning of June 30, when Confederate

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

and Union Soldiers had their memorable skirmish in front of the hotel. The warning sign was even then in the attic, perhaps. But did it greet the eyes of William Henry Harrison when he stayed overnight at the Fulton House in January of 1841, a month before he became President of the United States, and three months before he died? And did he know what it meant?

A gentleman to whom I talked concerning the ancient custom gave it as his opinion that bundling was possible only among people with unstable ideas or morality. "Immoral," he said they were. I suggested he meant "unmoral." He said only carpers and those whose morals are oblique differentiate between "immoral" and "unmoral." But Mr. Webster does. "Un-moral," he says, does not involve immorality, but indicates the absence of moral perception. To be immoral, he goes on, is to act contrary to conscience or morality. So I side with Mr. Webster. And I side against the gentleman who questioned the morals of the old-timers—or the present-timers who bundle. Perhaps bundlers subjected themselves to temptation—a temptation greater than which there is no other—but the majority of them withstood it. And were better for it. In the olden days when there were saloons on every corner there were also men who boasted they had never taken a drink in their lives, and were proud of it. But these men were entitled to far less credit than those who drank their share and became tee-totalers. So with the bundlers.

I imagine bundlers are roundly condemned by a great many readers of this column, by this time. Please understand this: These old-time sleepers were practically clothed. Perhaps the word "practically" is mis-used; at least they were almost entirely clothed. So are occupants of the automobile parked in the dark, the occupants of the swing on the dark corner of the porch, the lovers on the davenport in the dimly lighted living room. What's the difference? One is 1928; the other not. Or is there really "bundling" today? The column would really like to know. Is it true, what the gentleman said about the locality four hours from McConnellsburg?

Accounts such as these are interesting because of their historic background. It doesn't require much effort to determine how general the practice of bundling at hotels might have been years ago, when we note all that transpires about us today.

* * * * *

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

It would be most interesting to gather and publish accounts of some roving bands of gypsies, for actual reminiscences on bundling. Then, too, it can undoubtedly be said of many circus and theatrical people, that, due to their manner of living and travelling, it would be impossible to avoid what in any other instance would amount to bundling.

The article by "M. H. J." dated July 25, 1928, occasioned a number of contributions to his valuable column from various sources during August, 1928, a number of which we reprint here for what they may be worth. It is evident from the number of contributors, that bundling is still known to many of them, and that dissertations such as this are welcome where men and women care to delve in the history of the past.

M.H.J.—You are out of season with your bundling stories—this is a cold weather sport. I know, for when a lad I worked in a printing office, and the old boy at the next case had bundled—knew all about it.

He told me it was done to save wood in the fire place, and candles. He had a nice, big, taffy-haired girl, and when the old folks went to bed, he and his girl followed suit, but the old man made him step into a big bag, which was tied tightly under his arms with the knot in the back.

Of course now, the rumble seat has ruined the bundling, but this isn't the season anyway—unless you are trying to introduce it amongst the younger set of today, but you are probably too wise—but they don't do it in summer time, anyway. S. S.

—
“ * * * However, bundling was taken advantage of, and some young men made a practice of going around the country, and they became known as “professional bundlers.” It was this class of bundlers that the strict church members frowned upon more than the other. H. B.”

—
A young man whose name is withheld declares he heard of bundling for the first time two months ago, when he was actually introduced to the practice by a quite charming young woman; and he is willing to swear that during a long and fashionable existence he spent no more chaste evening.

—
A gentleman employed at the Capitol, who spent his boyhood days in a hamlet between Kutztown and Reading, tells me that bundling was well known in that section, and is yet, to some extent. M.H.J.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

Writing from somewhere in Lancaster county, apparently—because the envelope is postmarked Lincoln, a gentleman tells that “bundling” has certainly not entirely disappeared.

“I have read the book you mention,” he says, “but among old-timers in Lancaster county the girl who bundled was not provided with a special sleeping garment which slip-knotted at the waist and was tied securely at the ankles. Both the bundlers wore ordinary sleeping garments—“night gowns,” in those days. But the girl slept underneath the top sheet, and the other bundler on top of that sheet, so there was always the sheet between them. The custom has not disappeared, by any means, and it is not regarded, either, as a breaker down of morals. I might say, too, that only occasionally is there bungling in the bundling.”

M.H.J.— * * * in my native New England bundling frequently is referred to. As I always understood it, the practice goes back to Colonial days when families lived in two rooms, the first floor being heated by a fireplace and the loft being used for sleeping—and a bitter cold place it was.

When some young swain from miles away came to court the young hopeful of the family, neither he nor the young lady desired to remain in the presence of others. Not having warm sedans or dance halls or movies to go to in those days, the young people went to the loft to spoon. But it was cold up there so they were bundled.

Those old bundling sweethearts were a lot more moral than some of the sweethearts who go fifty miles into the country in an open roadster nowadays, I may venture to say. At least they were supervised in olden times.

I have heard my grandfather mention that bundling was practiced in Northern Vermont when he was a boy and I have heard the old people up there mention it myself. I have no doubt but what bundling still may be found in some of the mountain homes up there to this day.

D. W. P.

The following items are among many that have been communicated to Mr. Aurand, subsequent to the publication of “More About Bundling:”

Instances are told of sewing together the various parts of women’s underwear!

A Lebanon county physician is authority for a statement that bundling is a current custom in Monroe county.

In the days of other years the Pennsylvania-Germans had an expression for the girl who was with child: “Se is uf gabundled.”

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

Near Lancaster, just recently, one of the best informed historians we know gives the information that the old time courting custom—bundling—is still indulged in there.

Sometimes bolsters were placed between couples courting in bed. A Pennsylvania-German expression goes with that practice: "Ar dos net iw'r 'n kupa-kisa krodla kon, is ken mon!"

"Bundling exists in the Kishacoquillas Valley, and Big Valley, Mifflin county, Pa., in 1928. Girl sleeps under covers; boys on top of covers," relates one who made personal investigation after publication of "More About Bundling." He also says: "In the same neighborhood, where illegitimate births occur, the mother is compelled to go before the church body, and there confess to the various incidents of her past—with whom, where and when. Such confessions are made quite freely, no persuasion being necessary; and it is said that marriages often take place just after such confessions."

A well-read gentleman and historian, living at Lock Haven, Pa., while discussing the subject of "bundling," said that he had never heard of the word, as a "custom." He courted, in his youth, across the mountains from Lock Haven, in Sugar Valley. Here lived mostly farm folks from eastern Pennsylvania—the Pennsylvania-Germans. Young men and young women, in this locality, when bed time came, enjoyed their courting practices according to a term which they called "split the bed." This was a common joke to all young men in days not long since, and was usually but a more or less innocent pastime.

—
And so on — ad infinitum.

* * * * *

Charles Dickens, famed writer, would hardly come under the category of a bundler, but he closely approaches sleeping with strange women, as he did with men, which he personally relates in an account on a canal boat voyage from Harrisburg, to Pittsburgh, in 1842. Dickens says, in his *American Notes for General Circulation*, in the Leipzig, 1842 edition, that

I have mentioned my having been in some uncertainty and doubt, at first, relative to the sleeping arrangements on board this boat. I remained in the same vague state of mind until ten o'clock or thereabouts, when going below, I found suspended on either side of the cabin, three long tiers of hanging book-shelves, designed apparently for volumes of the small octavo size. Looking with greater attention at these

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

contrivances (wondering to find such literary preparations in such a place), I descried on each shelf a sort of microscopic sheet and blanket; then I began dimly to comprehend that the passengers were the library, and that they were to be arranged, edge-wise, on these shelves, till morning.

I was assisted to this conclusion by seeing some of them gathered round the master of the boat, at one of the tables, drawing lots with all the anxieties and passions of gamblers depicted in their countenances; while others, with small pieces of cardboard in their hands, were groping among the shelves in search of numbers corresponding with those they had drawn. As soon as any gentleman found his number, he took possession of it by immediately undressing himself and crawling into bed. The rapidity with which an agitated gambler subsided into a snoring slumberer, was one of the most singular effects I have ever witnessed. As to the ladies, they were already abed, behind the red curtain, which was carefully drawn and pinned up in the centre; though as every cough, or sneeze, or whisper, behind this curtain, was perfectly audible before it, we had still a lively consciousness of their society.

The politeness of the person in authority had secured to me a shelf in a nook near this red curtain, in some degree removed from the great body of sleepers: to which place I retired, with many acknowledgements to him for his attention. I found it, on after-measurement, just the width of an ordinary sheet of Bath post letter-paper; and I was at first in some uncertainty as to the best means of getting into it. But the shelf being a bottom one, I finally determined on lying upon the floor, rolling gently in, stopping immediately I touched the mattress, and remaining for the night with that side uppermost, whatever it might be. Luckily, I came upon my back at exactly the right moment. I was much alarmed on looking upward, to see, by the shape of his half yard of sacking (which his weight had bent into an exceedingly tight bag), that there was a very heavy gentleman above me, whom the slender cords seemed quite incapable of holding; and I could not help reflecting upon the grief of my wife and family in the event of his coming down in the night. But as I could not have got up again without a severe bodily struggle, which might have alarmed the ladies; and as I had nowhere to go to, even if I had; I shut my eyes upon the danger, and remained there.

One of two remarkable circumstances is indisputably a fact, with reference to that class of society who travel in these boats. Either they carry their restlessness to such a pitch that they never sleep at all; or they expectorate in dreams, which would be a remarkable mingling of the real and ideal. All night long, and every night, on this canal, there was a perfect storm and tempest of spitting; and once my coat, being in the very centre of a hurricane sustained by five gentlemen (which moved vertically, strictly carrying out Reid's Theory of the Law of Storms,) I was fain the next morning to lay it on the deck, and rub it down with fair water before it was in a condition to be worn again.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

* * * * *

The Pennsylvania-Germans are entitled to a good share of credit for the continuation of the practice of bundling. In almost every community where "Pennsylvania-German" is spoken as a dialect today, the reader can find many traces of this old custom. It is a pleasant way to carry on a courtship, even with all our present facilities for keeping the house warm, or ways of going to and fro! So why give up an agreeable pastime say those who may not have any idea at all that they are engaged in old-time practices?

* * * * *

While in the very act of placing these accounts in type, a gentleman of some sixty years informs us that his father, a German by birth, positively did not know the sex differences between man and woman, until he had reached the age of 30! The man referred to settled in Lancaster county, where our informant was born. It is no doubt obvious to the reader that sex innocence of the generations in the past, was entirely responsible for the continuation of the common practice of indiscriminate commingling of boys and girls and of men and women; related and unrelated; loved and unloved; with so comparatively few instances of the birth of illegitimate children from what little illicit intercourse may have taken place. Compare the sex knowledge of the man of 30, say sixty to seventy-five years ago, with that of a young person of 12 to 15 years of age today! That poor old man of a century ago can scarcely have known anything!

An account told to the writer just a few days ago runs substantially as follows: "I'm in my sixties now, and live in the western part of Schuylkill county, Penna. I've bundled; and I married the girl I bundled with. After sitting up nights for six months, it was suggested by her, and agreeable to me, as well as to her folks, that we should do our courting in bed, and sleep together. I want to assure you that in eighteen months after we had started bundling, or courting in bed, my girl was just as much a lady, and just as chaste, as she was two years before, when I started going with her. No improper relations had taken place during all that time, (and I was a steady caller at her home), because in her I recognized a person deserving of love and sincerity in all dealings, in consequence of which at the end of two years we were married." This is a typical account of many living in rural communities.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

In the upper part of Dauphin county, not long before Christmas, 1928, substantially the same incidents occurred, as is recounted in the foregoing account. The principals in this instance are known to the writer, and what happened was this: Mr. T., working in Harrisburg, with the young lady to whom he was paying attention, decided to visit his nearest relatives — his grandparents and an aunt and her family, living together in the upper part of the county, over the week end.

Having arrived at the old homestead and spending most of the evening in reminiscing, retiring for the night was duly brought into the conversation. The young man asked that one of the spare rooms in a modern, well-appointed house, be assigned the young lady, while he offered to take another room. To this there was not a little objection on the part of the family heads, who reasoned that Mr. T., being in courtship, and paying regular attention to the said young lady, should sleep with her, and to which they added their blessings. Such arrangements were not unusual, the elders said, and doubtless the reader will not unduly envy the young man and woman who have hosts of such generosity.

Now this happened in 1928, and within forty miles of the city of Harrisburg, capitol of the State of Pennsylvania! Is it so very dissimilar from the stories Dr. Stiles tells in his account? Compare it with numerous other accounts in *More About Bundling*, and the present offering. Note what an old traveller had to say:

Burnaby, in his *Travels in North America*, in the 18th century, says that the "lower orders" of the Anglo-Americans adopted a style of courtship called *tarrying*, which was as follows: — When a man was enamored of a maiden he proposed for her to her parents, and if they had no objection to him, they allowed him to "tarry" with her for one night, in order to give him an opportunity to court her. The couple got into bed together, still wearing their undergarments, so as to prevent a scandal. If they agreed they got married, if otherwise they parted. The *tarrying* was generally conducted without any improprieties.

* * * * *

While the above account of "tarrying" represents a period of at least two hundred years ago, it continues to find favor in Pennsylvania, or at least parts of the State, in perhaps greater proportion than one cares to admit. Removal of

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

part of the wearing apparel in going to bed years ago was sound policy. In those days one didn't need to worry about creased trousers, or well-kept clothes. The best was none too well appearing, or fitting. But too many clothes made one uncomfortable, in bed, and no matter how cold the atmosphere. Too many clothes makes one uncomfortable even these days, not forgetting to mention that even in some rural communities where "style" has not made much inroad or impression, it is the common thing for young men to remove their trousers where they intend to stay with their girl-friend after the mid-night hour.

Ridding one's self of trousers, (not necessarily an "overt" act), gives assurance that if the lovers are to sit up on the divan, or davenport, or couch, for an entire Saturday night, as many country lads and lassies do, they need not feel awkward when about dawn or later, the young man, if he recovers his trousers, does a few possible chores after reaching his own home, and then directs his step toward Sunday School and Church. At times it proves very annoying to have to hunt for the trousers next morning, or whenever one feels like calling it a "night." There are any number of instances where, anticipating a very agreeable night with a young lady anybody could love, in the anxiety of "getting set" for the occasion, the trousers may slip back of couches or davenports. Even though the young man and the girl's father may be the best of friends, it doesn't make any one feel very pleasant or comfortable to be suddenly interrupted during the night, or early in the morning, in fond embrace, and not be wearing said trousers! Girls' dads and mothers sometimes do arise early to do chores about the house and farm, but we have never heard of any accounts where any of these partly clad lads have been "shot at sunrise" for being too impetuous!

There are accounts of Snyder Co., Pa., lads who removed trousers, remained all night on the davenport in the parlor of their girl friend's home, to discover their trousers missing next morning — missing for a time, at least. They were discovered considerably after the dawn of day in another part of the house, where the faithful watch dog had dragged them. Kid brothers, too, are responsible for tricks of this kind. But this is a part of rural life, and is readily enjoyed by all to whose lot it may fall, much of the time in simple innocence, and not without great pleasure and delight.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

The city life is rather hard and shallow, and sometimes not a little inexpensive. The greatest joys are to be found where "angels do not fear to tread." So to find joy and happiness in the manner of courting, we enjoin the reader to direct attention to the rural avenues; where men are still men, and where women still trust, and indicate by their demeanor an innocence difficult to discover "where the crowds go."

* * * * *

It is hardly necessary, and it might be rather difficult, in a way, to go into any details of bundling on the part of those people commonly called Mennonites. We find them scattered largely through Lancaster county, as well as Mifflin county, Penna.; Virginia, West Virginia, and Canada. They are a people whose customs and habits have changed about as little as any of those whom we class as early settlers in Pennsylvania; many features apparent today among them, are like those of their ancestors of generations ago. While they have expensive makes of automobiles, radios, and some few other modern conveniences, their home life and customs have changed but little, and they are readily distinguished from others by a peculiarity in dress. They are followers of a religious leader of old, Simon Menno, and most of them adhere tenaciously to the old religious teachings, and continue to speak the Pennsylvania-German dialect. As there are approximately sixteen different sects in the Mennonite faith any amount of data on folk lore, and the custom of bundling, and other peculiarities in their family life, not now generally known, ought to be obtained. However, they are generally more or less *incommunicado* to strangers, and it is true that their business is their own! Nevertheless, the better informed men of their sect admit that bundling is practiced among them, but with no bad results as a rule. A Mennonite college professor told the writer some time ago that the Mennonites in Canada, part of the sect split in Pennsylvania, some years ago, still bundle, "and they bundle in the good old-fashioned way, too," he added. What is true in their case is undoubtedly true in many others.

Mifflin county, Pa., has a considerable number of people called "Amish," not unlike the Mennonites. These people, too, make much ado about bundling, and some of their accounts in current times, read like those of early New England days, where the church body had something to say when bungling and bundling went hand in hand. Here we are told, the

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

girl sleeps under the covers, while the lad remains above. The Kishacoquillas and Big Valleys are noted for this custom. Some unusual incidents occur occasionally which require a delicate touch in the telling. Sometimes it happens that members of the sect are late for devotional services, and, when taken to task by the elders or leaders for their tardiness, some very unusual, and strange answers are obtained. However, admonishments to the guilty suffice, unless the practice continue too long. In the same county, in the Amish neighborhood, where illegitimate births occur among their number, the mother is compelled to face summary proceedings before the leaders of the sect, and to them confess to the various incidents of her past — with whom, where, when and under what circumstances. Such confessions are usually made quite freely, with little show of modesty, no persuasion being necessary. It is said that marriage to the male parent of such illegitimate child is often consummated just after such confessions.

* * * * *

To bundle, a girl or young woman may be chaste, or unchaste; i. e., she may be a virgin, or "second-hand." Bundling females do not always disclose or expose their status, by any means. It may require months and months of courting to discover certain things, no matter what the means employed, or inducements offered.

With the Jews, of course, and especially true of them, in times of old, and today as well, virgins are primarily and almost consistently the demand of those who intend to marry. Originally the Jews selected Wednesday for a wedding day, because the Sanhedrim held its sitting on Thursday, and therefore the newly married man could immediately after his wedding bring his wife before the meeting if he had any ground of complaint against her, such as not being a virgin, or for other reasons.

Speke, in his *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile*, says that at Karague, "At night I was struck by surprise to see a long, noisy procession pass by where I sat, led by some men who carried on their shoulders a woman covered up in a blackened skin. On inquiry, however, I heard she was being taken to the hut of her espoused, where, bundling fashion, she would be put to bed; but it is only with virgins they take so much trouble."

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

Contrast the forgoing account with that of some South American Indians, where a virgin was not chosen for a wife, virginity being regarded as a sign that the woman had not the art of making herself pleasing to man, and she was therefore to be avoided.

Companionate marriage is not so new — in the Congo section of Africa. Among the lower classes there, when a girl is marriageable, her parents enclose her in a tent for about a month, where she receives the addresses and presents of different suitors. At the end of the time she selects one who best suits her taste; and, in order that the couple may become well acquainted with each other, they live together on trial for two or three years, at the end of which time, if they have agreed, they marry; if not, they separate. And I submit to the reader that this has been the custom in Africa for generations. The fair thing for American disciples of companionate marriage, would have been to "tell the world" that they had adopted, or developed their ideas from savage tribes in parts of the world scarcely ever touched by white men!

* * * * *

We have enough curious courting and kindred customs here in America to write about undoubtedly, but one cannot pass such as this one in the north of England. Brand says there was formerly a custom "for the young men present at a wedding to strive, immediately after the ceremony, who could first pluck off the bride's garters from her legs. This was done before the very altar." Sometimes to prevent an indecent assault the bride gave garters out of her bosom, or allowed them to remain untied and hanging loosely. Another writer says that the brides frequently untie the garters, leaving them to hang loosely, so as to prevent a curious hand from coming too near her knee! This done, the gallants present tied the garters to their hats, while the bridesmaids carry the bride into the bedchamber, where they undress her and lay her in bed.

The American plan nowadays is to go as far away from home as one can afford on a honeymoon, and by the time they get back home the novelty of serenading, and certain types of tricks has pretty well subsided. Just recently, however, we read an account in an eastern Pennsylvania newspaper, where the bride and groom returned home from their honeymoon to their newly-furnished house, to discover that "friends" had been there before they arrived, and as a sur-

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

prise had turned almost everything in the house topsy-turvy. In this instance they did even fasten a cow-bell under the bed, as is not uncommon in rural communities today, as part of the reception festivities to newly-weds.

* * * * *

Pre-marriage and marriage ceremonies in Spain, we have come to learn, are substantially the same as those of France and Italy. The early Spaniards had a custom, which they learned from the Moors, of exposing to view out of the balcony or window of the bridegroom's house, on the morning after the wedding day, evidences of the bride's purity at the time of her nuptials.

Currently, in America, similar displays subsequent to marriage are not generally made publicly, except perhaps in the rural sections. The modern laundry does away with the necessary show of triumph.

If the following account is not akin to bundling, why was it indulged in? Was it for the purpose of instruction? It is said that in early times the Scottish lairds and barons regulated the marriages of their vassals, and had the right to sleep with the wife of any of them on the first night after marriage. It is also historically recorded that "Eugenius III., king of Scotland, did wickedly ordain that the lord and master should have the first night's lodging with every woman married to his tenant or bondman, which ordinance was afterwards abrogated by King Malcome III., who ordained that the bridegroom should have the sole use of his own wife," but in enjoying the privilege the poor "sucker" had to pay a certain sum of money to the over lord. The account is not very much unlike similar instances of clergymen in America, during the past few generations, who have duped their communicants and have delegated to themselves the rather novel experience and pleasure of sleeping with the bride on the first night. Sometimes this was repeated for several nights, before the bridegroom came into possession of his own.

The pre-marriage and marriage ceremonies of the more modern Germans had many curious characteristics. Thus, in some districts the bride was obliged to renounce all the rights of her family over her, which was done by throwing straw into her parents' house. If a woman married a man by whom she had been seduced, she went to church early in the day, without any accompanying music, and sometimes

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

in country places her neighbors went to church with her, wearing crowns of straw. If the bride did not cry when she was married, her virtue was suspected; hence, to prevent such a censure, some arts were used to make her tears flow.

In the 16th century it was not unusual for marriage ceremonies in France to take place at the outer door of the church, rather than at the altar. The suggestion being that in early times it was thought to be indecent for the clergy to grant permission in the church itself for a man and a woman to lie together. Again it has been suggested that such church-door marriages would be more in the nature of public ceremonies, the real intention of the Church.

For horribly suggestive (!) customs, this one, coming from old France, also will be appreciated by the student of folklore and sociology. Marriage by proxy was allowed. This custom prevailed at Auvergne, where also the lord of the soil had the privilege of attending at the "bedding" of a bride, and of putting one leg in her bed. A pecuniary compensation was, however, generally accepted in lieu of this, and ultimately the amount was fixed at one *crown*. Even in England, years ago, a bridegroom could marry by designating some one as a proxy, who placed his leg in the bride's bed, thus figuratively taking possession of the bride's bed and body. If this custom prevailed in America today, wonder what the attitude of marriageable persons would be?

In Finland it was a custom for a young woman to wear suspended at her girdle the sheath of a knife, as a sign that she was single and desired a husband. Any young man who was enamored of her obtained a knife in the shape of the sheath, and slipped it into the latter article slyly. If she kept the knife the sign was favorable, and on the converse. In another part of Finland the young couple were allowed to sleep together for a week—called the week of the breeches—before their wedding day, but neither of them was entirely undressed. This custom is similar to that called bundling, or tarrying.

Neither in rural Pennsylvania, nor in the larger centers of population are there any distinctive marks of estate among the unmarried. It appears that the awakening of their senses and the acquiring of not a little knowledge by the time they reach a high school age, eliminates the need for a "sign" of willingness to marry. Methods of courting in current times have so outgrown what might be called customs, that to define a custom would be well-nigh impossible.

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

* * * * *

A Schuylkill county educator, in 1927, related a not unusual experience in his youth, in the part of the country in which he was at that time. He had just finished a course at school, and had taken up teaching at Duncannon. While there he was invited to visit at a rural home about six miles from town. He accepted. During the evening while he was there, a heavy rain came, and on the approach of early night, or bed-time, told his hostess, that although it was raining rather hard, he ought to leave for home. This the hostess tried to dissuade him from doing, and finally he agreed to stay for the night. All went well—for a time.

The hostess informed her guest that they didn't have much room, and no spare room, so that he would be obliged to sleep with her grown daughter. To this the daughter made no objection, but the guest did, and the young teacher again made protestations, saying that he ought to go home; but to no avail. However, at a not very late hour the entire family repaired to bed, the guest being assigned to the daughter's room.

We shall not attempt to explain why, but there wouldn't be the least bit of an excuse in the telling of it, if it were not for the fact that when the young man saw the girl start to undress for bed—well, the worst happened; he went home! Some inexplicable part of the young man's nature must have driven his better sense from him. In the suddenness with which he was thrown into the presence of a fine young miss, it is easily conceivable that a man's nerves are at a high tension, and to stay there for "better or for worse," or to leave, were optional. In the predicament which he found himself, we doubt whether he gave much thought to anything else but a breath of "fresh air." Whether it was "air," or moisture he needed, has never been fully explained, but as was the case, he suddenly made a break for the bed-room door, downstairs, and home—six miles in the heavy down-pour of rain—on foot!

From that day (or rather night) on, the hostess and her daughter have never paid the slightest attention to the nice young man, and teacher, tilting their heads and chins at every chance meeting, and entirely "freezing" him at every opportunity. All these were respectable persons in their home communities, and as to the truth of the story, we do not doubt.

* * * * *

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

A method of placing obstacles in the way of bundlers in Pennsylvania is not necessarily strange, or unusual. It does show, however, what confidence fathers and mothers had in the integrity of their daughter and the young man who happened to be her beau, and who called at the home to court. Time and again the young folks were permitted to go to bed together—both sleeping under the covers, and not a few times scantily clothed. A single bolster, or pillow, was all that separated the two young people attired in “nighties,” as most young people wore at the time and place we speak of. The bolster, too, was nearly as sound in principle, and protective, as would have been an irate parent who might have stood guard all night with a shot-gun watching for a violation of the chastity of his child, or some other breach of faith.

For *bona fide* lovers, the arrangement was most suitable, for in those days they could wait a reasonable length of time to marry. But the sense of humor that is typical of the Pennsylvania-German, comes out boldly, at this juncture, and they have long since learned to fling the following remark at any young man who is known to court where the bolster is the “obstacle.” They say: “*Ar dos net iw'r 'n kupa-kisa krodla kon, is ken mon!*” A free translation for the reader immediately appraises him of the fact that honest bundling is hard to continue for any length of time, in those parts, and yet be a man in the sight of fellowmen, for the meaning is: “He that cannot crawl over a pillow, isn’t a man!”

Doesn’t an old story illustrate the bolster idea rather sharply? While Mary and John were out for a lover’s stroll on a pleasant Sunday afternoon, Mary noticed a pretty flower in the field, along the road they were following.

Mary: John, isn’t that a lovely flower?

John: Yes; shall I crawl over the fence and get it for you?

Mary: How could you crawl over the fence, John, when you can’t even crawl over a pillow?

* * * * *

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

* * * * *

Any persons interested in the old-time hemp bags, in which the farmers usually put up three bushels of wheat, or at other times would tie up their daughter so that she could bundle with her beau, will find interesting specimens in the Landis Museum, H. K. Landis, proprietor, in Landis Valley, Lancaster county, Pa. Here are some of these old bags, bearing dates of more than a hundred years ago. It is not our purpose to say that any girls ever bundled in the bags on display in this museum, but to note that anyone who ever had to court while thus "protected," certainly earned any pleasure thus enjoyed in the company of any suitor. And this pleasure can hardly have consisted of much more than a mere holding of hands, or an occasional luke-warm kiss!

* * * * *

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LEHIGH
COUNTY.

HOLLIS *v.* WELLS.

August Term, 1845.

In an action brought to recover damages for the seduction of the plaintiff's daughter, it appeared that the defendant and the daughter slept together on the occasion of the seduction, according to a custom which prevails in the part of the country where they resided, known as bundling, and with the knowledge of the plaintiff: Held, that the knowledge of the plaintiff amounted to connivance, and he could not therefore recover damages.

This was an action on the case to recover damages for debauching the plaintiff's daughter, by reason whereof he lost her services and incurred expenses in various ways.

The daughter S. H. was called as witness, and testified that she was a single woman of the age of twenty-three years, that she had a child, that the defendant was the father of her child, which was about one year old, that she lived with her father when her child was begotten, and when it was born, that her mother was deceased and that she kept house for her father, that she had been at a battalion training, and that the defendant went home with her, that they took supper and very soon went to bed together, that the child was begotten that night, that he was there twice afterwards, and that he slept with her both times, according to the custom of the country, that her father knew of this custom in the family, that her father knew that the defendant was sleeping with her on the night of the battalion, that her father was not in the same room with them, but that he knew they were in bed together, that she thought he saw them in bed together. He was in the room where they were that night, but he might not have seen her in bed with the defendant.

D. H. a son of the plaintiff, was called as a witness, and testified that he saw the defendant at his father's house on the night of the battalion, and that he saw the defendant

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

and his sister in bed together that night. A number of other witnesses were called, and testified to the good character of the plaintiff and his family, and of this daughter except in this matter.

The defendant's counsel requested the court to charge the jury on the following points.

1st. That the plaintiff cannot recover in this case, because the defendant was in bed with his daughter with his knowledge and consent.

2d. That there can be no trespass, if the plaintiff connived at the criminal intercourse between the defendant and his daughter.

BANKS, P. J., charged the jury, as follows:

This action is brought to recover damages for loss of services of the daughter. It is in all cases of this kind, necessary to prove that she at the time performed some acts of service for the father. Service, tho' trifling, is enuf to support this action. In this particular, this action is fully sustained. The relation of master and servant is but little more than fiction, made use of as necessary merely to support the action. The jurors are not confined, in their estimate of the damages, to those sustained by reason of this loss of service, and the expenses consequent upon the seduction. For this, but little compensation is given in most cases. It is seldom thought of in determining the amount. The jurors look to higher considerations, and reflect upon the dishonor and disgrace which is cast upon the plaintiff and his family by such an injury. The wounded feelings of the father, in the loss of comfort in his daughter, in whose virtue he feels no pride, and from whose society he can draw no consolation, are pressed upon the jury. That her example may corrupt the morals of his other children, will always have some weight. For their injury, and this distress and deep anguish, a compensation is awarded.

It is the highest duty of a parent to give proper instruction and education to his children, and to take care of their morals. The parent who neglects the culture of his children, and suffers them to grow up useless to others and shameful to himself, has conferred but little benefit upon them or upon the community. He who thus neglects his own family, generally receives his reward in those griefs and degradations which are sure to follow its members, thus raised in ignorance, vice and irreligion. It is in some degree optional with

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

a parent, whether he will raise up his children to be ornaments or a disgrace to himself and family. The best instruction and the best example, are sometimes lost on children. This renders it no less the duty of every father to have a well regulated house. He should guard the morals of his children in his own house and under his own roof. If he does not do this, let the consequences fall upon himself. As the fault is then his own, his complaints are not deserving of much favor. This action is always founded on a wrong done by the defendant, and as regards the will and consent of the father, the daughter is supposed to be violated with force. It is this absence of consent on his part, this violation of his daughter's chastity against his will, that entitles him to sustain his action for a compensation in damages. When the criminal intercourse has been had with his knowledge and under his connivance, he would seek redress with but an ill grace indeed. He would not actually be a *particeps criminis*, but in want of decency and in breach of parental duty, he would approach very near to it. His indifference to his daughter's morals and chastity, would meet with but a just retribution in her misfortune and disgrace. The fault would be as much his own as hers or her seducer's, and his assurance in coming to court to ask for a reward for the perpetration of a wrong which was known to him and which he might have prevented, would justify the belief that he had no objections to its commission.

Much has been said by the plaintiff's counsel about the custom in courtship which he has denominated "bundling." He has said that this custom prevails very generally in the part of the country where these parties reside. This may be so, but I am unwilling to believe it. If it is so, it is time the custom should be abolished. Even if this custom does prevail, it furnishes no excuse for the plaintiff's carelessness, or his daughter's indiscretion. If it be any excuse, it would extend equally to all concerned, and the defendant might claim his portion of protection under it also. The plaintiff has by this time, I apprehend, found out that this custom is dangerous at least, if he does not feel that it is indecent. A man who takes no pains to abolish this custom in his own house, has no right to complain of consequences which most naturally follow.

The defendant's points have presented to us the plaintiff's conduct as a subject for us to charge on. The evidence as to his knowledge that the defendant and his daughter slept

BUNDLING PROHIBITED!

together, is indisputed. It is really a part of the plaintiff's own testimony. It appears to have been adduced by him as necessary to fix the paternity of the child upon the defendant, as if this alone were important and sufficient to make out the case. It did not appear to have occurred to him, that "*volenti non fit injuria*," was a sound legal maxim. The plaintiff's conduct was in the highest degree exceptionable. He did not object to the defendant and his daughter sleeping together, if he did not discourage it. He knew of it, and took no steps to prevent it. The connection which has produced this action, may be traced to his own misconduct. The wrong is attributable in a very great degree to himself, and he ought not and cannot maintain this action for an injury arising out of a criminal intercourse at which he connived.

Verdict for defendant.

*

*

*

*

*

*

